

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.THE DAILY HERALD, published every
day in the year. Four cents per copy. An-
nual subscription price \$12.NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and
after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly
editions of the New York Herald will be
sent free of postage.All business or news letters and telegraphic
despatches must be addressed New York
Herald.Rejected communications will not be re-
turned.
Letters and packages should be properly
sealed.LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK
HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.Subscriptions and advertisements will be
received and forwarded on the same terms
as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 12

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

BROOKLYN THEATRE.
Washington street.—TICKET-OF-LEAVE MAN, at 8 P. M.
Mr. W. Florence.SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.
Corner of Twenty-third street.—NEGRO
MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.ROBINSON HALL.
Sixteenth street.—BEGONE DULL CARE, at 8 P. M.;
closes at 10:15 P. M. Mr. Macaboe.GLOBE THEATRE.
Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.PARK THEATRE.
Brooklyn, opposite the City Hall.—PANCHON, at 8 P. M.;
closes at 11 P. M. Mr. Schuch.LYCEUM THEATRE.
Greenwich street.—TWIXT AXE AND
GLOWN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:15 P. M. Mr. Rousby.WALLAUGH THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE SHAUGHRAUN, at 8 P. M.; closes at
10:30 P. M. Mr. Boucquet.WOODS MUSEUM.
Broadway, corner of Third street.—WORKINGMEN
OF NEW YORK, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.METROPOLITAN THEATRE.
No. 226 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30
P. M.PARK THEATRE.
Broadway, between Twenty-first and Twenty-second
streets.—OPERA COMIQUE—LE VOYAGE EN CHINE, at 8
P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Minelli, M. de Quincy.TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
No. 201 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45
P. M.NEW YORK STADT THEATRE.
Bowery.—DER PERSCHWENDER, at 8 P. M. Miss Lina
May.OLYMPIC THEATRE.
No. 24 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45
P. M.BOOTH'S THEATRE.
Corner of Twenty-third street and Sixth avenue.—
LITTLE EMILY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M. Mr.
Rosa.THEATRE COMIQUE.
No. 214 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45
P. M.ROMAN HIPPODROME.
Twenty-sixth street and Fourth avenue.—Afternoon and
evening, at 7 and 8.FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.
Twenty-eighth street.—MERCHANT OF
VENICE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M. Miss Carlotta
Lecroque, Mr. E. L. Davenport.BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
West Twenty-third street, near Sixth avenue.—NEGRO
MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M. Dan
Bryant.GERMANIA THEATRE.
Fourth street.—HEIN LEOPOLD, at 8 P. M.NIRLO'S
Broadway—USCLE TON'S CABIN, at 8 P. M.; closes at
10:45 P. M.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities
are that the weather to-day will be less cold
and cloudy, with light rain, sleet or snow.WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were ir-
regular and at the close lower. Gold was
steady at 112½. Foreign exchange was with-
out feature. Money loaned on call at 2½ and
3 per cent.THE PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTA-
TIVES yesterday condemned by resolutions the
Louisiana outrage, and appointed a committee
of seven to frame an appropriate protest. The
Senate and the Governor will probably be silent.GERRIT SMITH.—Yesterday evening, at the
Shiloh Presbyterian church, colored citizens
and old abolitionists met to pay a tribute to
the memory of Gerrit Smith, and addressed
to his widow a memorial which we print to-
day.LET MR. BLAINE SPEAK.—The Speaker of
the House has repeatedly spoken bravely for
the republican party. Can he now be silent
when not only the party but the country calls
upon him for his views? Let Mr. Blaine
know that the people will forgive no man who
has no opinion now, or, having one, does not
dare to give it.THE PACIFIC MAIL INVESTIGATION was con-
tinued yesterday, and is getting decidedly
more interesting. Mr. Abert gave a list of
payments he had made to a number of corre-
spondents and other persons, the total amount
being \$120,000. In some of these cases the
payments are like mountains and the names
like mole hills.THE BECHER TRIAL yesterday was very in-
teresting, and made dramatic by the ap-
pearance of Mrs. Beecher and her family in court.
Indeed, not only the principals, but nearly
all those who are intimately connected with
the case, were present. The day was occupied
principally by Mr. Morris, who opened the
prosecution in a powerful argument, which is
elsewhere published in full, together with a
vivid description of the exciting scene.LET MR. JEWELL RESIGN.—The Postmaster
General, although he admits he is "no law-
yer," has correctly "supposed that a Legis-
lature is the sole judge of the rights and
qualifications of its members as members, and
that redress for its action must be sought
through the judicial rather than from the
executive department of the government."How can Mr. Jewell consistently remain a
constitutional adviser of a President who be-
lieves just the contrary, and holds that a
Legislature has no right to judge of the qual-
ifications of its members, but that the army is
the lawful arbitrator of its disputes? Either
the Postmaster General must resign or con-
tinue to hang upon this darkened adminis-
tration "like a rich jewel in an Ethiopian's ear."

The Meeting Last Night.

In numbers and respectability the meeting at the Cooper Institute realized the most sanguine expectations. The tireless resolutions having been introduced at an early stage were listened to by the vast audience with praise-worthy patience, but will be found rather heavy reading by the few who do not skip them in the morning journals. The meeting derives all its importance from the speeches, and especially the able, temperate speech of Mr. Everts, which was the great feature of the evening. It is fortunate that the first two addresses, after the brief introductory remarks of Mayor Wickham on taking the chair, were by such eminent republicans as Mr. Bryant and Mr. Everts, who occupied most of the time until nearly ten o'clock and gave a non-partisan tone to the occasion. We will try to restate such of the points and arguments presented during the evening as were received with most favor by the meeting and elicited the warmest applause.

A marked feature of the best speeches was the broad line of discrimination they drew between the general question of the legitimacy of the Kellogg government and the military proceedings which have so deeply stirred public feeling. It was the sense of the meeting, so far as it could be gathered from the heartiness and unanimity of its responses to particular features in the reasoning of the speakers, that the general political condition of the South is an entirely separate question, which should not be mixed up with the unwarranted and dangerous interference of the federal army with the organization of a State Legislature. By keeping these subjects distinct the whole force of the argumentation was converged to a point upon which there ought to be no conflict of views between political parties. President Grant was held responsible for this unconstitutional use of the army, not as having planned and directed it at the outset, but for his strong and unqualified indorsement after it had been done. Sheridan was leniently dealt with by Mr. Everts, because his remarkable and most astonishing telegrams ceased to be his and became President Grant's as soon as the latter had communicated his full approbation. The tendency of the meeting was to fasten the whole responsibility upon General Grant, and to arraign him, not for his original support of Kellogg, nor for his opinion of the White League, nor for his political sympathy with the Louisiana republicans, nor for the encouragement he gave to the Returning Board when it was manipulating and falsifying the returns and counting in men who had never been elected, but solely for the employment of federal soldiers to drag members of the Legislature from their seats. By narrowing the arraignment down to this one point and fixing the responsibility upon the President alone the republican speakers at the meeting were able to steer clear of party questions and put the discussion on the high constitutional ground on which citizens feel not as republicans or democrats, but as Americans and lovers of liberty. It was judicious to place republican speakers in the front and give them the audience during the best part of the evening, and they were prudent and wise in avoiding topics on which there is any reasonable ground of difference among citizens of their own party. Mr. Everts indeed conceded that the great outrage which he condemned might justifiably be turned by the democrats to party advantage if the republican party should uphold the indefensible conduct of the President, but that it would be unreasonable to regard them as the President's abettors without allowing them an opportunity to show their attachment to those principles of freedom which have always been held equally dear and sacred by all men born on American soil and nurtured in the tradition of liberty.

The peril of such military interference with the rights of legislative bodies was placed in a striking light by some of Mr. Everts' illustrations. In arguing that this is as much the affair of every other State as it is of Louisiana, he showed that the same kind of military violence would be no worse if exercised in the electoral college of a State than it is when exerted in a State Legislature. The votes given for Presidential electors in a State are counted and declared in the same manner as the votes for State officers; and if, when they had assembled as an electoral college to cast their votes for President the same kind of questions should be started as to their right to seats, and the Governor of the State should successfully invoke the assistance of the federal army to disperse or remodel an electoral college, such interference might change the result of a Presidential election—a question in which the people of all the States have an equal interest. There is no pretext for excusing the employment of the army to change the political complexion of the Legislature of a State which would not be equally good for employing it to reconstruct the Electoral College of a State, and, by reversing the choice of that State for President in a close election plunge the country into the horrors of civil war. If this had been the year of a Presidential election the votes in Louisiana would have been counted by the same Returning Board, the same difficulties would have arisen as to seats in the Electoral College, and there would have been just the same pretences for its dispersion by military violence; and if the result of the Presidential election had happened to turn on the vote of that State a civil war would have been the natural and almost inevitable consequence. If the people submit to this first usurpation General Grant, if he should be a candidate in 1876, has only to follow in several States the precedent he has now set in one to re-elect himself in defiance of the will of the people, as declared by their votes. Unless prompt public indignation renders the repetition of what President Grant has now done impossible our free popular institutions are subverted and destroyed. The constitutional argument in condemnation of the President, as stated by the speakers last evening, is solid and impregnable. There are only two cases in which the constitution permits him to employ military force in a State at all. One of these is invasion by a foreign army, which it is his duty to repel; and the other domestic violence in a State directed against its government. But in a

case of domestic violence he cannot act without an application from the State itself, by its Legislature when it is either in session or can be convened, and by the Governor in sudden emergencies of such urgency that the Legislature cannot be assembled. On the late occasion the Legislature of Louisiana was actually in session, which fact completely stripped Governor Kellogg of all authority to ask for federal troops. With the Legislature in session only the Legislature had any right to make such a requisition, and the President, in such circumstances, had no more authority to recognize and grant a request of the Governor than he had to employ the army in Louisiana on the application of Marshal Packard or Collector Casey. This point is so clear that a mere statement carries its own evidence, and no sophistry can confuse or weaken it. The action of the President has therefore not an inch of constitutional ground to stand upon.

We trust that this great and imposing meeting, so strong in numbers and personal respectability, so strong in argument from republican sources, and so emphatic in its indorsement of sound constitutional positions, may not be without influence in strengthening Secretary Fish and other fair-minded republicans in high places in their opposition to the fatal policy of President Grant.

How the City Finances are Managed.

Mr. William E. Warren, an experienced accountant, who is practically familiar with the operations of the Finance Department of the city government, calls attention through the columns of the *Evening Post* to the matter of interest on assessments collected from the property owners assessed for improvements. It appears that up to and including the year 1870 the receipts from this source were set off against the disbursements for interest on assessment bonds issued by the city for and on account of such improvements, and the surplus balance only was raised by taxation. Mayor Wickham in his recent Message calls attention to the fact that some twenty-one millions of these assessment bonds are outstanding this year. The Comptroller asks for interest on the whole of this amount, and the full sum of such interest is included in the tax levy for the current year. Mr. Warren says:—"I understand that interest continues to be charged upon assessments and collected by the Collector of Assessments and the Clerk of Arrangements. If that is so what becomes of the money? If it is not applied toward paying interest on assessment fund bonds, street improvement funds, &c., &c., as formerly, how is it disposed of?"

These are pertinent inquiries. But the whole matter of the collection of assessments and arrears requires to be very thoroughly investigated. As the assessments come in what is done with the money? How often and in what amounts does it pass into the city treasury? How long does the Chamberlain hold it before the bonds are redeemed? If it is all paid into the city treasury, and goes into the banks of deposit as soon as it is received, how long is it kept there before the bonds are taken up and cancelled? We get four per cent interest on our public deposits; but we pay seven per cent interest for the loans we make on account of these improvements on the several descriptions of bonds, forming what is called our "temporary debt." It is a poor financial policy if we keep money in bank at four per cent and pay out seven per cent interest on the money we borrow. This assessment bond business and the collection of personal taxes demand a very searching scrutiny.

Howling.

If anything will destroy the moral effect of the victory of the conservatives in the issue forced upon them by President Grant's usurpation in Louisiana it will be the tone adopted by such men as Andrew Johnson and Mr. Lyons, of Virginia. These gentlemen, and some of our Senators like them, see in this controversy only an opportunity for the display of temper. Mr. Johnson was never a moderate man, and as he is now a candidate for the Senate we can understand the eagerness of his rhetoric. We can hardly be patient when we see the ex-President describing his successor as "a little man, physically and mentally," and Sheridan as "a little upstart," as "depending upon a spurious reputation," and as managing to "come in and claim the laurels when better men have won the victory." It is unworthy of the dignity of a gentleman who was President of the United States. It represents passion, not justice.

Judge Lyons addresses a letter to the Governor of Virginia which deplores the surrender of Lee and breaks into a fury against General Sheridan, who is "a butcher dog," and "infamous Phil," "howling for the blood of Southern men." Governor Kemper, of Virginia, seems to have caught the spirit of these hot phrases, and he answers Judge Lyons in a letter more guarded in tone, but intemperate and unfortunate.

The temptation to lose one's temper over events like those in Louisiana can be understood. Nothing can be gained by turning a grave measure of constitutional right into a vulgar attack upon the military career of Grant and Sheridan. The effect will be that the conservative republicans—the men who would be quite willing to criticize the administration and condemn its acts in Louisiana—will feel that these voices are simply a revival of the spirit of the Confederacy. They will be heard in vain. The public opinion of the North is quite willing to censure the administration for all it has done in defiance of popular sovereignty in the South, but it is not ready to admit that the generals who have commanded its armies are "quacks" and "howling dogs."

LET MR. FISH RESIGN.—The Secretary of State—and once that Secretary of State was an important officer under our government—says that he was not consulted, nor did he see the two despatches which were sent to General Sheridan declaring that the whole Cabinet approved of his course. He is understood to have denounced as an outrage the action of the military in Louisiana. How, then, can Mr. Fish remain in a Cabinet in which he has been misrepresented and officially made an accomplice in deeds which he disapproves? Would Marcy have borne such a degradation tamely, or Webster or Seward? Undoubtedly they would have resented such an insult by resignation, and we do not see how Mr. Fish can any longer hold his position in the

Cabinet without losing what must be far dearer to him—his place in the respect of the American people.

Carl Schurz's Speech.

The speech of Mr. Carl Schurz in the Senate yesterday, reproduced in full in our columns, is worthy of even his own splendid reputation as an orator and statesman. It begins with a brief recital of the facts, so clear and unprejudiced a recital that even the defenders of the acts in Louisiana must accept it as the truth. He then gives a definition of the United States laws which can possibly apply to such acts, and refutes the claim that the military, in interfering with the Louisiana Legislature, had the authority of any law whatever. This exposition of the law and the facts is masterly, dismisses all side issues, and ends with the deliberate judgment "that the deed done on the 4th of January in Louisiana constitutes gross and manifest violation of the constitution and laws." The spirit of usurpation is then declared more alarming in the instrument the Executive chose to carry out his will. Mr. Schurz pays a deserved compliment to General Sheridan's military achievements, but says "the policy he has proposed is so appalling that every American citizen who loves his liberty stands aghast at the mere possibility of the suggestion." He then asks the Senate how long it will be, if these things can be done in Louisiana, before they are done in Congress, before a general of the army may sit in the Senate to decide contested elections, and a soldier take from the Speaker of the House the mallet which represents his power. He points out that abuses of power have grown greater by the misfortunes of the country, and that the country is on a downward slope. Disorders in the South he does not deny, but he affirms that the unconstitutional interference with the Southern States has only increased disorder there and created new dangers for the country at large. The culmination of this policy is the military outrage in Louisiana, which requires the people to make a stand here and now or lose the Republic. Mr. Schurz does not believe that the Republic has failed, but insists that those who defend acts of arbitrary power imply that it has failed, and that peace and order cannot be constitutionally maintained in America. If there is a revolution in the South such acts only increase it, for how can the citizens of Louisiana be expected to "refrain from revolutionary acts if the national government has set them so revolutionary an example?" He warns Senators against the danger of such acts; urges the people of the South to continue "the sublime patience and peace with which they have borne that which was excessive sufficient for revolution," in the belief that "the time cannot be far distant when every American who truly loves his liberty will not fail to recognize his own cause in the cause of constitutional government in Louisiana." He refers to the fact that the people believe no longer in the blood and murder cry, nor accept it as an excuse for usurpation. "No man will be permitted to obscure the grave constitutional question before us with any side issues; for from whatever point of view you may contemplate it every consideration of law, of moral right, of justice, of the public policy and the common welfare, puts the deed done in Louisiana only in a stronger light as a lawless transgression of arbitrary power pregnant with wrong and disaster." He asks that Louisiana shall be restored to the right of self-government, and closes with an eloquent appeal to Senators to be true to the constitution and the people, and not to let the Republic, which should be the guiding star of liberty, become another warning example to mankind.

The moderation and dignity with which Senator Schurz has treated this great question make clearer the irresistible force of his argument, and the utter absence of partisanship will command for it the respect of the country. We do not see how it can be answered. Mr. Morton did not see any method when he evaded the issue in his reply yesterday. The argument of Mr. Schurz stands upon the facts and the law, and no array of murders and wrongs committed in the South can change the admitted truth of military interference with a sovereign Legislature or shake the constitution, which forbids it. In the language of the brave and true Senator himself, the people demand, "if there be an argument in defence, let it, at least, be on a level with the dignity of the occasion." It is sad to know that even in the Senate of the United States a meaner argument is possible.

Drawing the Lines.

It seems to be well understood that there is division in the councils of the administration on this question of Louisiana. To prevent the breach which, with an independent Cabinet, should ensue, the President has, it is now stated, set about arranging matters so that the protesting members may have some excuse to remain. The clumsy manner in which this is to be accomplished is related elsewhere, and no more ridiculously Pickwickian settlement can be imagined. The hesitancy of the President about sending in the message of explanation and defence shows that he has been summoned to halt, even as he was summoned during the St. Domingo intrigues. He has had a docile party in many ways—a party that has followed him with celerity, directness and unreasoning obedience. There have been occasional mutinies, but they have been severely punished. Sumner's peerless and illustrious name could not save him from his fate when the President commanded. He was dragged out of the party and executed as summarily as Napoleon executed the Duc d'Enghien. So with Schurz and Trumbull and Greeley, and many others as deserving, if not as conspicuous. The strength of party discipline and allegiance was never more strikingly shown than in the willingness of Mr. Fish to remain an uncompromising member of the Cabinet of President Grant.

Even the republicans see where this must end. Mr. Fish cannot throw his honored name and reputation under the hoofs of federal troopers. Mr. Bristow, with his flowering hopes, cannot be expected to leap Niagara in the train of a military ring. Mr. Jewell is the chief of a proud party in a proud State, an alert and experienced politician, and he cannot silently be stifled by the President. The country expects that these men will mutiny. They owe it to their fame and to the good of the party from which they hold their offices and distinction, and which is far

more to them than the vanishing honors of a dying administration. Mr. Blaine is a leader in republicanism. In a year of cumulative disaster he saved his State. Upon his brow the crested honors of the coming fight seemed to fall. He has an interest in the party beyond the President, because it is an interest in the Presidency. He is a young man, who has made his own record and has his own party following. Why should he plunge with the administration into political perdition? Mr. Wilson, who was an honored republican long before President Grant's ambition looked higher than an increase of his wages as a tannery clerk in an obscure frontier town, must remember the disdain with which the President treated suggestions which might have saved the canvass—suggestions that there should be an explicit declaration against the third term. He cannot approve the outrages in New Orleans, and he is too brave a man to even condone what he does not sustain.

Is there any wonder that there should be mutiny and restlessness and a tendency to draw the lines? In this way independent democrats drew the lines on Buchanan, when by the aid of the army he endeavored to force the Lecompton constitution upon the people of Kansas. The result was that the administration was destroyed, the party broke, and the democracy were driven into a retirement from which it is now only emerging. Let the independent republicans like Fish, Blaine and Wilson think of anti-Lecompton and profit by the lesson.

A Murky Precedent.

In great parliamentary crises, as every one knows, the first thing done is to look up "precedents." Our crisis is not in any sense parliamentary, or, in our form of speech, Congressional, and if it were we are not trained in much respect for the authority of what has been done before. Still, precedents have a certain sort of interest, and if, as in the Maryland case of 1866, recently disinterred, they have a little *ad hominem* flavor, they do command attention. A forgotten precedent, which in some of its features is on all fours with what has been attempted in Louisiana, has occurred to us. It was the day of wild, old-fashioned statesmanship, when the great powers of the federal government, the exceptional power to interfere with the States, were held with strict reserve. The resemblance is only in incidents and details. The results were entirely divergent. It is the case of what is known in Pennsylvania as the "Buckshot war," and may be simply stated. Joseph Ritner, abolitionist and anti-Mason, was a minority, or, rather, plurality Governor when elected, and, as his term of service drew near the close, in 1838, he became, if possible, more so. We don't insult his memory by comparing him with Kellogg; but his administration was not the most chaste, and he and his advisers had reason to dread, as Kellogg has, the advent of a new Governor and an honest Legislature. The election of that year showed that both were at hand. Then was it that Thaddeus Stevens and his confederates in Harrisburg and Philadelphia determined and proclaimed their resolve "to treat the election as if it had not occurred," and, by false returns, to secure a majority in the Legislature, so as to secure impunity for the misdeeds of the past. They had a pliable "returning board," just as Kellogg has, and it excluded precincts just as Kellogg's does precincts, and it gave false certificates. Armed with these the simulated members in both houses claimed their seats. At this democracy a brave, rough thing in those days, revolted, and the honestly elected members, holding honest certificates, went to Harrisburg, backed by a lobby not at all disposed to be trifled with. Both parties, rather turbulently, claimed the Legislature, and two rival assemblies in the same building were organized. There was confusion and riot and threats of violence all round. Rognery, however, is very apt to show the white feather (here, too, there is a Kellogg parallelism), and at a moment when possibly a little boldness might have won the Speaker of the Senate the Secretary of the Commonwealth and Mr. Thaddeus Stevens jumped out of a back window and fled the wrath to come.

Then was it that Governor Ritner, not a wicked but a weak man, wholly in the power of the unscrupulous men around him, called on the President of the United States (Mr. Van Buren) for military aid to suppress "domestic violence." He even indicated the mode. "There was a squad of cavalry at Carlisle barracks, less than twenty miles off. The President did not even answer the letter, but referred it to the Secretary of War, who did, very promptly and emphatically. He peremptorily refused to interpose, resting his refusal on the ground that the federal government had no right to meddle with a State Legislature, organized or disorganized, and there being, by the Governor's confession, a body in existence known as a Legislature, he had no right to ask for help. The whole country acquiesced in the decision, the honestly elected Governor and Legislature were installed, and the frustrated conspirators sank into oblivion. These are well attested historical facts, and if there be any need of proof they are so, Senator Simon Cameron—then a ferocious and aggrieved democrat—is quite competent to give it.

Our Emigration.

An official statement from the Commissioners of Emigration for December gives us an idea of the falling off in emigration to the United States. During 1874 the number of passengers, including citizens, who arrived in New York, was 149,762. The citizens and natives did not amount to more than 1,200, so that this figure may be said to represent the emigration during the year. In 1873 the number of emigrants was 268,288, showing a decrease during the past year of 118,526. We see no indication that this decrease will end, as the falling off increased from month to month, and was larger in December than in any month of the year. Thus, in last December, 3,212 emigrants arrived, while in December, 1873, the number was 5,239, showing a decrease in one month alone of 2,027. In analyzing the nationalities of the emigrants who came in the month of December we find that from the German Empire there were 1,567, and from Great Britain, including Ireland, 1,629. This shows that the larger part of our emigrants come from Great Britain, although Germany continues to almost rival her in numbers. The two prin-

cipal sources of supply, therefore, are Germany and Great Britain. France sends very few—not more than ten per cent of the Germans. From Sweden and Norway the emigration has almost ceased. Italy and Russia contribute a small number, but beyond Great Britain and Germany and the German States the arrivals from other foreign countries may be put under the election head of "scattering."

This does not represent the emigration to our Pacific coast, almost exclusively of Chinese. But the fact that we have lost nearly 120,000 of our yearly supply of emigrants is a serious one. Now and then we have had spurts of "native American" passion, which proposed to make political war upon the foreigner. But the mature opinion of the country is that our greatness and our growth depend upon the emigration from the great nations of Europe. What are the causes of this falling off? We look for some in the severe police system of the German Empire, which throws every obstacle in the way of the expatriation of the subject. But the real causes can be found in our national policy, the depression of business, the disasters that have befallen the agricultural interests in the West and the general fear of hard times and poverty. The failure of reconstruction in the South practically closes that vast and rich territory to the emigrant. The tendency of the Germans and the English and the Irish is to come to the United States. We have freedom, opportunity, liberal laws and genial customs. There is scarcely a State in which a foreigner may not find some one to whom he can speak about his home. The arming of Europe for a new war, the anxiety and suffering caused by the last wars, the feeling in the minds of all men that we are about to have a conflict as gigantic as that which overthrew Napoleon, the insecurity which the mother feels about her son or her husband, who may be dragged during the night to follow the drum-beat that leads to the battle field—all these European commotions are so many advantages in favor of the United States. We have thrown them away. We are throwing them away. We wantonly abuse this rich and apparently inexhaustible source of power. It is a question to interest our rulers at Washington and New York. There is no better opportunity for our statesmen than to restore this fertile and rapidly ebbing tide.

LET MR. BRISTOW RESIGN.—The Secretary of the Treasury denies that he ever authorized Mr. Belknap to telegraph General Sheridan that "all of us thoroughly approve your course." He declares that "the despatch was never seen by me until I saw it in the newspapers." Does not the liberty taken with Mr. Bristow's name virtually amount to its forgery, and can he consistently remain in a Cabinet in which he is considered a mere instrument of the President?

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

"The President and all of us have full confidence" in 1875.
Postmaster W. L. Bur, of Boston, is staying at the Astor House.
Fever exists in Rome to an extent very unusual at this time of the year.
Rev. John F. W. Ware, of Boston, arrived last evening at the St. Denis Hotel.
Colonel W. B. Beck, of the United States Army, is quartered at the Everett House.

Thirty-seven thousand persons in England pay the tax on the use of armorial bearings.
Lord Chesterfield's letters have been done into the language of the Parsees by a lady of Bombay. Congressman-elect William W. Warren, of Massachusetts, is sojourning at the Grand Central Hotel.

They notice at the Paris masked balls more dress coats and fewer fancy costumes than formerly.

Beecher preaches, as even his friends state the case, not to large congregations, but "to full houses."

Solicitor John A. Bolles, of the Navy Department, arrived from Washington yesterday at the Windsor Hotel.

Ex-Lieutenant Governor Allen C. Beach and family, of Watertown, N. Y., have apartments at the Windsor Hotel.

Oh, the glorious deadhead! At a recent "bal de vogue" in Paris there were present 2,119 persons, and of these 1,110 were deadheads.

A most entertaining autobiography is promised by the literary executors of Mr. Buckstone, the famous London dramatist, actor and manager.

The London *Spectator* warmly praises Julian Hawthorne's series of "Saxon Studies; or, Sketches of Life in Dresden," published in the *Contemporary Review*.

Archbishop Manning is thought not to have earned the approval of the Roman Curia by his English policy and to have a dubious prospect of the cardinal's hat.

But even if Fish and Bristow and Jewell can agree with the Message, the case on which the Message arose remains. Can they agree with the President on that?

Paris journals describe how General Banat, a Turk, residing in that city, moved from one house to another with his furniture and his harem. His wives went in two omnibuses.

In a Paris advertising sheet the following occurs:—"An orphan, aged nineteen, possessed of fourteen millions, wishes to marry a French prince. Answer, postpaid," &c.

Alexander Dumas has written a preface for a new edition of "Manon Lescaut." He seems to regard its author as the true head of the national school of romance, which, perhaps, is natural in him.

It is said that M. Thiers would like to unburden his mind by writing a reply to certain disagreeable allusions and direct aspersions upon himself which appear in the documents read at the Armin trial.

Professor Tyndall will reply to his adversaries all round in the *Popular Science Monthly* of February. The same number will contain a powerful article on "The Science of the Woman Question" by Dr. Van de Warker.

Here we claim to have the streets cleared of snow, but the Paris papers are clamoring, not for clean streets (that is never necessary), but to have the snow cleared from the tombs in the cemeteries. Fancy shoveling out Greenwood!

If General Sheridan states the case accurately, they have made a revolution on account of some extravagant language of the Southern people. Some one threatened to kill the radical members of the Legislature, and, therefore, a State is under foot.

Governor John O. Dominis, of Oahu, Hawaii, arrived at the Fifth Avenue Hotel yesterday morning from Boston, and left last evening for Washington. After transacting some private business for King Kalakaua the Governor will return the royal party at Chicago.

At Douay a man has just been tried for "violation of a sepulchre," because he poured a glass of gin on a comrade's grave, having previously swallowed the other half. It had been long previously agreed between them that they should take a last glass together in that way.

In Armin's letter on the Paris press and its German scribbles he mentions a M. Haefner, attributed to Gambetta. Haefner is in the revolt in Vienna in 1848, and is supposed to be the hunchback who seized the old Prince Metternich by the throat in his palace. In 1870 Haefner would have been sent out of Paris as a German, but for the intervention of another Prince Metternich, son of the former.